

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,978,118 to Vesikivi et al.

Claims 1, 7, 10 and 14 have been amended. Claim 6 has been cancelled. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 7, 10 and 14 are the pending independent claims. In the Office Action, the Examiner failed to provide a specific analysis of each independent claim, and entirely failed to address the recitations presented in any of dependent claims 2-5, 8, 9, 11-13 or 15-16. (See top of page 3 of the Office Action, generally referring to “Vesikivi, cols. 2-10”.)

As necessary to develop the record in this application,¹ it is respectfully requested that the Examiner issue a new, non-final Office Action that sets out the Examiner’s rationale for rejecting each of the five independent claims and eleven dependent claims.

To advance prosecution, Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to clarify that received information and reading identifiers and data corresponding to identifiers from the received information. Vesikivi et al. fails to disclose or suggest such recitation.

Claim 7 has been amended to clarify that the RFID recognition section includes a data conversion section. Vesikivi et al. fails to disclose or suggest such recitation.

Claim 14 has been amended to include the recitation of a data conversion section for converting information read by the ID reading section into data suitable for the address book. Vesikivi et al. fails to disclose or suggest such recitation. As explained at page 10, lines 1-6, of the Specification,

the data conversion section 207 obtains the information having identifiers necessary in the address book of the corresponding

¹ MPEP 2271 instructs that “Before a final action is in order, a clear issue should be developed between the examiner and the patent owner. To bring prosecution to a speedy conclusion and at the same time deal justly with the patent owner and the public, the examiner will twice provide the patent owner with such information and references as may be useful in defining the position of the Office as to unpatentability before the action is made final.”

terminal section 300 from among information read by the ID reading section 206, so as to restructure the address book data, thereby transmitting the restructured data to a control section 301 in the terminal section 300.

In the Office Action, the Examiner cites Fig. 8, Col. 9, line 3, to Col. 10, line 33, of Vesikivi et al. in regard to the recitation of structuring address book data using read information so as to be suitable for the address book. (Office Action, page 2.) Fig. 8 of Vesikivi et al. discloses numerous "textual data" fields, which each respectively correspond to third party information that the "user is able to receive [...] from the business card 2 because of the implementation of the RFID system." (Vesikivi et al., Col. 9, lines 21-23.) That is, as done in conventional systems, Vesikivi et al. stores the received RFID information in a single field. Storing received RFID information in a single field requires user input to facilitate update of address book information.

In view of the above, independent Claims 1, 7, 10 and 14 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability *per se* of dependent Claims 2-5, 8, 9, 11-13 and 15-16, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-5 and 7-16, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, it is requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' attorney at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Musella

Reg. No. 39,310

Attorney for Applicant(s)

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM
333 Earle Ovington Blvd., Suite 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-3565